Diachronic Variation in Romanian

Diachronic Variation in Romanian

Edited by

Gabriela Pană Dindelegan, Rodica Zafiu,
Adina Dragomirescu, Irina Nicula,
Alexandru Nicolae and Louise Esher

With a Foreword by Ian Roberts

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART III. VERBAL STRUCTURES

PART IV. DISCOURSE ISSUES

FOREWORD

IAN ROBERTS

University of Cambridge & Downing College
(igr20@cam.ak.uk)

The present volume is the first in-depth treatment of aspects of the diachronic syntax of Romanian to appear in English (see the Editors' Introduction for discussion of earlier works on the history of Romanian in English and French). As such, it represents a major contribution to several fields: diachronic syntax in general, comparative and diachronic Romance linguistics, and, of course, the description and analysis of the history of Romanian. The editors are to be congratulated on bringing together such a wide range of materials, and making them available in this way to an international audience.

It is well known that syntax was not the main emphasis of much traditional historical and diachronic linguistics. This situation began to change radically in the 1970s, owing to two developments. The first was the development of Greenbergian word-order typology (which was of course initiated by Greenberg in 1963). By the early 1970s, W. Lehmann (1973) and Vennemann (1974) had initiated the study of diachronic syntax in relation to basic word orders, using essentially Greenbergian methods. This led to the publication of seminal works such as Li (1975). The second development in the 1970s was the publication of David Lightfoot's (1979) *Principles of Diachronic Syntax*, which laid the basic groundwork for all subsequent generative work on diachronic syntax. The inception of the principles-and-parameters approach to comparative generative syntax in Chomsky (1981) made possible a conception of syntactic change as the resetting of parameters (usually thought to take place during first-language acquisition) and this directly led, in the early 1990s, to the establishment of a community of generativists working on diachronic questions which coalesced around the Diachronic Generative Syntax Conference (DiGS), which first met in 1990. Alongside the annual DiGS conference, there is now a book series (Oxford Studies in Diachronic and Historical Linguistics, edited by Adam Ledgeway and myself) and a journal devoted

to this topic (the *Journal of Historical Syntax*, an e-journal affiliated to *Language*). Diachronic generative syntax is now a thriving sub-specialism in its own right.

Functional and typological approaches to historical and diachronic syntax have also flourished in recent years. In particular, there is a burgeoning literature on grammaticalization (a term originally put forward by Meillet 1912); seminal works in this area include C. Lehmann (1982/1995), Bybee, Perkins and Pagliuca (1993), Heine, Claudi and Hünnemeyer (1991), Heine and Traugott (1991) and the textbook by Hopper and Traugott (2003), as well as Heine and Kuteva's (2002) *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. There is now a regular conference devoted to this topic, *New Reflections on Grammaticalization*. Finally, Heine and Narrog's (2011) *Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization* presents an authoritative up-to-date overview of this field. Recent developments in this area have moved towards "pragmaticization", the process by which discourse markers and other formal markers of aspects of context develop from lexical items (a pioneering work in this connection was Traugott and Dasher 2002). More recently still, construction-grammar approaches to diachronic syntax have developed, with the concomitant concept of "constructionalization" (see Traugott and Trousdale 2013).

Functional/typological and generative approaches to the description and analysis of syntactic phenomena of all kinds are quite distinct, and have often seemed at loggerheads (see Newmeyer 1998 for some discussion and overview). However, in the diachronic domain, they have to an extent proven complementary and dialogue between researchers working in the different paradigms remains open and lively. This aspect of diachronic syntax is reflected in the variety of approaches to the historical syntax of Romanian to be found in the chapters to follow and is, in my opinion, a real strength of this volume.

It has always been recognized that the Romance languages have a special place in historical linguistics, owing to the fact that their common parent is richly attested. Although of course it is in certain respects misleading to consider literary Classical Latin as the direct ancestor of the medieval and modern Romance vernaculars, there is nonetheless a considerable corpus of less literary Latin from all periods from archaic times to the Late Latin of the 5th century AD. Also, many of the Romance vernaculars are richly attested in the medieval period. In her recent discussion of the relation between Romance linguistics and historical linguistics, Sornicola (2011:49) concludes that the great wealth of data available to Romanists "may let them dream a less fragmented, and rather richer, dream".

In their Introduction, the editors of this volume point out that Maiden, Smith and Ledgeway (2011) and Ledgeway (2012), major recent treatments of historical Romance linguistics and syntax (respectively) "contain only cursory references to Romanian" (this volume, p. xvi). The same can be said of Maiden, Smith and Ledgeway (2013). The principal reason for this, one surmises, is the lack of any medieval attestation of Romanian. The oldest surviving reliably dateable Romanian text dates from 1521 (a letter sent by Neacşu Lupu from Dlăgopole [currently Câmpulung] in Wallachia, to Johannes Benkner of Braşov). By contrast, the oldest surviving French text, the *Serments de Strasbourg*, is conventionally dated to 842; that for Spanish (the *Glosas Emilianenses*) is from ca 1000, while the oldest Italian texts are legal formulae from the 960s, and the earliest attestations of Galician-Portuguese are from the 9th century. Romanian is therefore attested over a much shorter historical span than the other major national Romance standards (as well as a number of non-standard varieties: Neapolitan, Sardinian, Veneto and Sicilian are all quite richly attested in the medieval period, and medieval Catalan and Occitan are major literary languages).

However, one thing that has emerged very clearly from the extensive work on diachronic syntax in recent decades is that significant and interesting syntactic changes can take place over quite a short time span. Deep historical attestation of a language, although clearly of great interest and value for historical syntax, is not a necessary condition for useful diachronic work. This fact has emerged rather clearly from the intensive work on the historical syntax of English in recent decades. To cut a very long story short, it is not inaccurate to say that many of the features of Modern English which make it so unique in its historical and typological context (*do*-support, the progressive, the natures of non-finite complementation with both infinitives and gerunds, very liberal VP-ellipsis, the modal auxiliaries, highly impoverished verbal inflection, conflation of 2sg and 2pl pronouns, etc.; all features unknown in West Germanic and French) have arisen since the 16th century, in other words in a period comparable to that attested for Romanian (for a general overview and references on the historical syntax of English, see Fischer and van der Wurff 2006). A similar observation could arguably be made for the history of post-16th-century French (although French is less of an "outlier" in the Romance context than English is in the Germanic context, owing to its similarities with the Northern Italian, especially Gallo-Italian, dialects). Moreover, Brazilian Portuguese has undergone very significant changes in the past two centuries (see for example the articles collected in Roberts and Kato 1993).

The relatively late textual attestation of Romanian is therefore no reason to neglect the study of the diachronic syntax of this language. The papers collected here support this conclusion amply, by providing rich attestation of a wide range of historical phenomena in all the main syntactic domains (see the Editors' Introduction for detailed chapter summaries). And of course, it should not be forgotten that, although late-attested in the Romance context, Romanian still has a longer and richer historical record than the vast majority of the world's languages.

But there is of course more to Romanian than this. Romanian (construed at its broadest, so as to include Daco-Romanian, Aromanian, Megleno-Romanian and Istro-Romanian) represents a unique combination of substrate and adstrate influences, not found elsewhere in the Romance-speaking world. In particular, of course, there are the well-known features characterising Romanian as a part of the Balkan *Sprachbund* (including, in syntax, the future formed in periphrasis with "want", the near-total loss of infinitives, and enclitic definite articles); the available historical record allows us to observe a number of these properties emerging, most notably the gradual disappearance of infinitives with modal and aspectual verbs other than *a putea* ("to be able"), which survives with an infinitival complement (whose exact structural analysis is uncertain) in the contemporary language. This question in particular is dealt with by several papers in Part III of this volume.

Romanian also presents certain diachronic developments which are familiar from elsewhere in Romance, notably a decline in enclisis in favour of proclisis, a dramatic reorganization of clausal complementation as compared to Latin, a general move towards a more "analytic" syntax, especially in the verbal domain, and of course head-initial word orders. So we see, in the historical syntax of Romanian, a combination of familiar pan-Romance trends and quite unique (in the Romance context) contact-driven developments. There is nothing particularly surprising about this, but what is of great value is the achievement of the editors of the present volume in putting together a collection of papers which attests so vividly and convincingly to the value of studying the diachronic syntax of Romanian. As I said at the outset, this volume represents a significant contribution, not just to Romanian studies, but to diachronic syntax more generally and to Romance linguistics as a whole. The papers that follow make Sornicola's dream that much less fragmentary than before.

References

Bybee, J., R. Perkins, W. Pagliuca, 1993, *The evolution of grammar: tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Chomsky, N., 1981, *Lectures on Government and Binding*, Dordrecht, Foris.

Fischer, O., W. van der Wurff, 2006, "Syntax", in: R. Hogg, D. Denison (eds), *A History of the English Language*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 109–198.

Greenberg, J., 1963, "Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements", in: J. Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of Grammar*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 73–113.

Heine, B., U. Claudi, F. Hünnemeyer, 1991, *Grammaticalization: a Conceptual Framework*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Heine, B., T. Kuteva, 2002, *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Heine, B., H. Narrog (eds), 2011, *Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Hopper, P., E. C. Traugott, 2003, *Grammaticalization*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Ledgeway, A., 2012, *From Latin to Romance: Morphosyntactic Typology and Change*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Lehmann, C., 1982/1995, *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*, Munich, Lincom Europa.

Lehmann, W., 1973, "A structural principle of language and its implications", *Language*, 49, 1, 47–66.

Li, C. N. (ed.), 1975, *Word Order and Word Order Change*, Austin, University of Texas Press.

Lightfoot, D., 1979, *Principles of Diachronic Syntax*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Maiden, M., J.C. Smith, A. Ledgeway (eds), 2011, *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages. Volume I: Structures*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Maiden, M., J.C. Smith, A. Ledgeway (eds), 2013, *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages. Volume II: Contexts*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Meillet, A., 1912, "L'évolution des formes grammaticales". Reprinted in A. Meillet, 1958, *Linguistique Historique et Linguistique Générale*, Paris, Champion, 130–158.

Newmeyer, F., 1998, *Language Form and Language Function*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press.

Roberts, I., M. Kato (eds), 1993, *Português Brasileiro: Uma Viagem Diachrônica*, Campinas, Editora Unicamp.

Sornicola, R., 2011, "Romance linguistics and historical linguistics: reflections on synchrony and diachrony", in M. Maiden, J. C. Smith, A. Ledgeway (eds), *The

    Cambridge History of the Romance Languages. Volume I: Structures, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1–49.

Traugott, E. C., B. Heine, 1991, *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 2 volumes.

Traugott, E. C., R. Dasher, 2002, *Regularity in Semantic Change*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Traugott, E. C., G. Trousdale, 2013, *Constructionalization and Constructional Changes*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Vennemann, T., 1974, "Topics, subjects, and word order: From SXV to SVX via TVX", in: J. Anderson, C. Jones (eds), *Historical Linguistics: Proceedings of the First International Congress of Historical Linguistics, Edinburgh, September 1973*, vol. II, Amsterdam, North-Holland, 339–376.

EDITORS' INTRODUCTION

The papers included in this volume were presented at the workshop "Diachronic Variation in the Syntax of Romanian", held in December 2012 at the University of Bucharest. The present book consists of a selection of papers focusing on the historical grammar of the Romanian language, bringing together diverse theoretical approaches to address a number of key morphological and syntactic issues in the history of the morphosyntactic development of Romanian.

This volume is one of the first books dealing with the historical grammar of Romanian from a modern theoretical perspective. In English, there exists only one other work devoted to the history of Romanian, Alexandru Niculescu's *Outline history of the Romanian language* (published in Romania in 1981), a book with very limited circulation, which mainly focuses on the social history of Romanian. Works in other foreign languages, such as (in French) Ovide Densusianu's *Histoire de la langue roumaine*, published by Ernest Leroux (Paris) in 1938, and Alexandru Rosetti's *Histoire de la langue roumaine*, a 2002 translation of a Romanian book published in 1986, are generally old, and limited to historical morphology and phonology. Our volume contrasts with the aforementioned books in a number of important respects.

Where the existing literature provides a general overview of the history of Romanian, often weighted towards phonology or morphology, this volume is a collection of in-depth specialist studies investigating particularly salient issues in the history of the language. The majority of papers deal with topics in Romanian historical *syntax*, drawing on modern research methods and current linguistic theory, with a clear preference for parametric syntax. Both the nominal domain and the verbal domain, the most significant areas of grammar, are well represented in the volume.

The studies published here also draw on a much richer corpus of historical data than earlier works, since many more texts are available in philological editions today than when previous histories of Romanian were published.

In the context of current research on the history of the Romance languages, our volume is auxiliary to recent works such as Maiden, Smith and Ledgeway's *Cambridge History of the Romance Languages* (Cambridge University Press, 2011) or Ledgeway's *From Latin to Romance.*

Morphosyntactic Typology and Change (Oxford University Press, 2012), which contain only cursory references to Romanian.

The volume is aimed at advanced graduate and postgraduate students in Diachronic Linguistics, Theoretical Linguistics, Romance and Romanian Linguistics, as well as researchers in the fields of historical and typological linguistics, morphosyntactic theory and the history of the Romance languages.

The contents of the volume are organized into thematic sections on *Nominal and Adjectival Structures*, *Verbal Structures,* and *Discourse Issues*, preceded by a section containing the papers presented by the plenary speakers at the workshop (*Part I. Invited speakers*).

The invited speakers' papers focus attention on two major issues for the history of Romanian: a major syntactic issue, namely perfective auxiliary selection, and a major morphological issue, namely the paradigm of feminine nouns and the emergence of a new morphological pattern.

Adam Ledgeway discusses one of the central themes in Romance syntax, perfective auxiliary selection, examining the patterns of variation across Romance. He pays special attention to the way in which auxiliary selection in Romanian (a phenomenon largely ignored in the literature) supports Benveniste's idea that the auxiliary *have* should be analyzed as a surface realization of *be*. Moreover, his study of auxiliary selection in Romanian throws light on the structural alternation between *have* and *be* in other Romance varieties.

Martin Maiden argues that the Romanian feminine paradigmatic pattern (with one form for the nominative-accusative singular and another form for the plural and the genitive-dative singular) is autonomously morphological or *morphomic* (in the sense of Aronoff 1994). He explores the parallel diachronic development of feminine plural morphology and of feminine singular genitive-dative morphology, highlighting the significance of one recent exception to the general pattern, feminine mass nouns with three forms (the type *carne, cărni, cărnuri* "meat (SG)—meat (PL1)—meat (PL2)"), and concluding that lexical identity is a key determinant of the survival of morphomic structures.

Part II. Nominal and adjectival structures comprises studies of: the functions of the definite article in old Romanian; the diachronic variation of constructions with pronominal possessives; the re-analysis of the element *al* as an inflectional marker and the emergence of adnominal dative; the combinations of negative and indefinite pronouns; and, in the last three studies of this section, degree markers/intensifiers in old Romanian.

Camelia Stan investigates the relation between the two major functions of the definite article in old Romanian: definite determiner and inflectional marker. She pays special attention to structures with multiple determiners, which she analyzes not as definiteness spreading but as a multiple case-marking strategy; thus, the first article is both a determiner and a case marker, while the second one is merely a case marker. Two major diachronic processes are at work: restriction of the usage of the definite article as an inflectional marker, and competition between the suffixal definite article and the weak demonstrative *cel.*

Based on reconstructed data from Proto-Romanian and comparative data from Albanian, Ion Giurgea proposes an explanation for the reanalysis of Romanian *al* as a genitive marker. He shows that the special distributional pattern of *al* first appeared with pronominal possessors and was then extended to inflectional genitives by reanalysis. The reanalysis of *al* as a genitive inflectional marker correlates with the reanalysis of the dative as an adnominal structural case.

Adrian Chircu investigates the occurrence and development of phrases consisting of an indefinite pronoun and a negative pronoun in old Romanian; some of these structures have survived into modern Romanian, and some are also attested in other Romance languages, a fact which supports the idea that they may be inherited from Latin.

Gabriela Stoica explores the means of expressing adjectival intensity in Proto-Romanian, by comparing Latin and the earliest surviving Romanian text, as well as Romanian historical dialects. She shows that Romanian preserved the Latin system of marking intensity, but did not preserve the Latin degree markers. Instead, Romanian progressively grammaticalized various adverbs with an expressive meaning as degree markers; the study of old Romanian reveals different stages of the grammaticalization of different markers.

Raluca Brăescu discusses the grammaticalization of the intensity marker *foarte* "very" at the semantic, syntactic, and categorial levels, briefly comparing it with *tare* "strongly" which is found as an intensity adverbial in older stages of Romanian and in the present-day non-standard language. She also comments on a possible process of degrammaticalization which appears to manifest itself in present-day Romanian, namely the occurrence of *foarte* in verbal contexts.

Adina Dragomirescu's contribution examines two equivalent superlative constructions: *nespus de* (adverb + preposition) and *de nespus* (supine). Against previous analyses which argue for a direct relation between these two constructions, Dragomirescu's diachronic survey suggests that they

are different constructions, with different origins and different mechanisms of syntactic change: analogy and re-analysis.

The studies in *Part III. Verbal structures,* examine the following issues: the existence of "mixed categories" in old Romanian; complex predicates containing an infinitive; the usage of the infinitive in an 18th-century translation; the reflexive pronoun *sine* "self"; the grammaticalization of a constraint governing the passive reflexive construction in Romanian; and the grammaticalization of direct and indirect object doubling.

Gabriela Pană Dindelegan investigates the behaviour of several "mixed categories" (in the sense of Bresnan 1997 and Panagiotidis 2010) in old Romanian: an ambiguous infinitival head, which functioned successively as a noun and as a verb; a deverbal adjective derived by suffixation of *-tor,* with adjectival and verbal behaviour; and the supine form, with verbal and nominal features. While the history of the first two forms shows their loss of mixed behaviour, the issue is less clear-cut for the modern Romanian supine.

Isabela Nedelcu's chapter addresses the problems raised by complex predicates consisting of an auxiliary/modal verb and an infinitive. She compares the present-day situation with that found in the old Romanian corpus (16th–18th centuries) and in texts from the 19th century. Syntactic diagnostics show that complex predicates with an auxiliary display a high degree of cohesion, while those constructed with a modal verb are less cohesive. Both types of complex predicates displayed a lower degree of grammaticalization in old Romanian than in present-day Romanian.

Emanuela Timotin and Isabela Nedelcu's paper focuses on the unusually frequent use of the infinitive in a Romanian manuscript translation from Italian dating back to 1763 and influenced by the Italian source. The constructions taken into consideration are the following: coordinated infinitives, infinitives coordinated with subjunctives, infinitives selected by perception verbs, and infinitives preceded by different prepositions. The use of the infinitive in Vlad Boțulescu's translation highlights the numerous uses of this form in old Romanian, facilitating the identification of archaic, dialectal or innovating usages, and the explanation of their decline or revival.

Andra Vasilescu concentrates on the syntactic and pragmatic properties of the strong Romanian reflexive *sine* "self", by comparing old and contemporary Romanian data. In old Romanian, the functions of reflexivity and intensification markers could overlap, and were also shadowed by the usage of the personal and demonstrative pronouns. The investigation of *sine* "self" throws light on the diachronic changes concerning reflexivity and intensification in Romanian.

Alexandra Cornilescu and Alexandru Nicolae analyze subjects of reflexive-passive sentences, which, in contrast to the subjects in the *be*-passive construction, show a curious constraint: only a non-<e>-type denoting subject is felicitous (thus, personal pronouns and proper names are excluded). This constraint was not operative in older stages of Romanian. The authors analyze the reflexive-passive construction as a distinct type of clause: a transitive configuration with a null subject in the canonical subject position. They show that the denotational constraint on the subject of this clause is a type of crossing constraint arrived at through the strengthening of the effects of the Animacy Hierarchy, which requires that in reflexive-passive sentences the Theme should not outrank the Agent.

Camelia Uşurelu examines the changes in the domain of direct and indirect object clitic doubling from the 16th century to the 20th century. Her main conclusion is that the clitic doubling pattern arises prior to the first surviving Romanian texts, while the *obligatory* rules for clitic doubling are more recent (from the 20th century).

Carmen Mîrzea Vasile's paper focuses on a restricted group of five Romanian clitic adverbs (*şi* "also; immediately", *cam* "about; somewhat", *mai* "also; still", *prea* "too", *tot* "still; continuously"), the only elements that can intervene within the verbal cluster. Finding that the fixed order recommended by traditional grammars does not correspond to real usage, she demonstrates that the so-called "deviant" order is associated with particular semantic, pragmatic, phonological and lexical conditions. The observed synchronic variation is the consequence of the diachronic evolution of these adverbs within the verbal complex.

In *Part IV. Discourse issues,* Rodica Zafiu investigates the diachronic change of two markers whose functions were apparently similar in old Romanian: the deictic presentatives *adică* and *iată*. She identifies a number of syntactic differences between the two items, and illustrates their additional functions as focalizers and connectors. As she demonstrates, these differences between the two markers increased from the 18th century onwards: *adică* became a reformulator, losing its presentative value, whereas *iată* extended its occurrences as a presentative marker and preserved its function as a focal particle.

We hope that the studies presented here—proof of the increasing interest in diachronic morphology and syntax—will offer new historical data on Romanian and form a starting point for new debates and discussions in the fields of Romance linguistics, linguistic typology, and theoretical and historical linguistics.

PART I

INVITED SPEAKERS

CHAPTER ONE

ROMANCE AUXILIARY SELECTION IN LIGHT OF ROMANIAN EVIDENCE[1]

ADAM LEDGEWAY

University of Cambridge & Downing College
(anl21@cam.ac.uk)

1. Introduction

Romance perfective auxiliary selection continues to represent a topic of enormous interest among Romance and theoretical linguists, having given rise to a wealth of literature over the years (for an overview, see Ledgeway 2012:§7.3.1.1, §7.4.1.1). Yet, the significance of the Romanian evidence in this area has generally gone unnoticed[2], with the relevant facts remaining largely unknown and insufficiently explored, at least outside of Romania[3]. In what follows, by contrast, it will be argued that a familiarity with the Romanian evidence proves essential for a proper understanding of Romance auxiliary selection. Before considering, however, the Romanian facts, it is instructive to briefly review the various patterns of auxiliary selection found across other Romance varieties (Ledgeway 2012:292–299, 311–317):

---

[1] I would like to thank Adina Dragomirescu and Irina Nicula for their extremely helpful comments and corrections on an earlier version of the present article. Any outstanding errors are of course the responsibility of the author.

[2] See, for example, Frâncu (1970), Marin (1985), Dobrovie-Sorin (1994:ch.1), Avram (1994; 1999), Monachesi (1999; 2005:133–196), Avram and Hill (2007), Dragomirescu (2009; 2010:204–211; 2010; 2012:204–105, 208–210, 214–215), Dragomirescu and Nicolae (2009), Nevaci and Todi (2009), Pană Dindelegan *et al.* (2010:249–262), Pană Dindelegan (2012:569, 579–280; 2013b:220; 2013c:229).

[3] Cf., among others, the descriptions in Lee (2000:133) and Penny (2000:228) which incorrectly claim that Romanian only displays the HAVE perfective auxiliary.

(1) a. **¿Has**   trobau   as   claus?
         (you)have   found   the   keys
         "Have you found the keys?"
     b. L'   augua   **yera**   bullida
         the   water   was   boiled
         "The water had boiled"
(2) a. **So**   /   **Si**   fatecate / ite
         (I)am   (you)are   worked gone
         "I/you have worked/gone"
     b. **A**   fatecate /   ite
         have.3   worked   gone
         "(S)He/they has/have worked/gone"
(3) a. **sɔ**   mˑanʤɛi̯t   (**aɟɟə**   manʤɛi̯t) /
         (I)am   eaten   (I)have eaten

         sə   m(ˑ)anʤɛi̯t   (**a**   manʤɛi̯t)
         (you)are eaten   (you)have eaten
         "I/You have eaten"

     b. **a**   manʤɛi̯t /   ***e**   mˑanʤɛi̯t /
         (he)has eaten   (he)is   eaten

         e   rˑʊmwɛsə / ***a**   rʊmwɛsə   sʊul
         (he)is   remained (he)has remained   alone
         "He has eaten/remained alone"
(4) a. **Hó**   mangéto nu   muórzo /
         (I)have eaten   a   bite
         Sóngo jut'   acco   sòcrema
         (I)am   gone   at   mother-in-law=my
         "I had a bite to eat/I went to my mother-in-law's"
     b. Jé **fóvo** ritto ca te   **fuve**   puósto cu
         I was   said that you   (you)were   placed with
         Nannina ca   **fóve** fètto   sciàrra cu Satóre
         Nannina that   was done   quarrel with Satore
         "I had said that you had got engaged with Nannina who
         had quarrelled with Salvatore"
(5) a. Si el sieruo que **es** fuydo mora   mucho en
         if the servant that is fled   remains much   in
         casa   de   algun   omne
         house   of   some   man
         "If the servant who has fled stays a long time in some
         man's house"

        b.   si ladrones que furtan de dia &   de noche
                 if thieves   that steal of day and   of night
                 ouissen   entrado
                 had.SUBJ   entered
                 "if thieves who steal by day and night had got in"

(6)   a.   Ja   **havia**   fumat
                 already (I)had   smoked
                 "I had already smoked"

        b.   Ja   **havia**   arribat
                 already (I)had   arrived
                 "I had already arrived"

The Aragonese examples in (1) illustrate a common conservative pattern widely attested across Romance whereby HAVE (1a) and BE (1b) are respectively distributed according to a transitive-unaccusative split (Vincent 1982; Bentley 2006; Cennamo 2008), whereas the examples in (2) from the Lazio dialect of Acquafondata illustrate a person-driven pattern common to many dialects of central and southern Italy, as well as some Piedmontese and northern Catalan dialects, according to which 1st/2nd persons (2a) select BE and 3rd person (2b) selects HAVE (Tuttle 1986; Manzini and Savoia 2005; II:729–745; D'Alessandro 2010:31–32). Alongside these varieties, we also find dialects such as the Pugliese dialect of Altamura which combines both of these options into a single system of so-called triple auxiliation (Loporcaro 2007), where 1st/2nd person subjects (3a) invariably align with BE (albeit in free alternation with HAVE in the case of Altamurano), but 3rd person subjects retain the conservative transitive-unaccusative HAVE/BE split (3b). Our fourth pattern involves a temporal split as exemplified by such dialects as Procidano spoken in the bay of Naples (Ledgeway 2009:624–626), which displays a traditional HAVE-BE transitive-unaccusative split in the present perfect (4a), but the generalization of BE in all other perfective paradigms (4b). The old Spanish examples in (5) highlight, by contrast, a modal split, common to many medieval varieties (Ledgeway 2003; Stolova 2006), whereby the traditional transitive-unaccusative split, witness the use of BE with the unaccusative *fuydo* "fled" in (5a), is overridden in irrealis modal contexts with the extension of auxiliary HAVE to all predicates, as with the unaccusative *entrado* "entered" in (5b). Another frequent pattern, especially in Ibero-Romance and the extreme South of Italy, is the generalization of HAVE to all verb classes and grammatical persons, witness the Catalan examples in (6) (cf. Mateu 2009).

Whereas the six auxiliary patterns reviewed above are found across a number of Romance varieties, the distribution of the two auxiliaries in Romanian is unique to that language and follows a pattern which we can informally characterize in terms of a finiteness split or, following Avram and Hill (2007), a realis/irrealis split: whereas HAVE surfaces in finite contexts where the verb is overtly marked for person/number Agr(eement), which uniquely obtains in the present perfect/preterite (7a), auxiliary BE (viz. *fi*) is found in all other non-finite contexts, namely the perfect infinitive (7b), the future and conditional perfect (7c), and the perfect subjunctive (7d).

(7)   a.   **Am** /   **Ai** /   **A** /   **Am** /
             (I)have   (you)have ((s)he)has   (we)have
             Aţi /   **Au**   mâncat / plecat
             (you)have (they)have   eaten   left
             "I/you/(s)he/we/you/they have(/has) eaten/left
             (…ate/left)"
       b.   Înainte de a **fi**   mâncat/ plecat citeam
             before of to be.INF eaten   left (I)read
             ziarul
             newspaper.DEF
             "Before having eaten/left, I was reading the newspaper"
       c.   Vor   / Ar   **fi**   mâncat / plecat
             (they)will (they)would   be.INF eaten   left
             "They will/would have eaten/left"
       d.   Nu cred   să **fi**   mâncat / plecat
             not (they)believe SĂ be.INF eaten   left
             "They don't believe that I/you/(s)he/we/you/they
             have(/has) eaten/left"

2. Questions

Having established the basic facts of auxiliary alternation across Romance, we shall now outline the questions in relation to Romanian which we shall explore in the rest of this paper. Our first question relates to how the Romanian finiteness split arises historically. While a rich body of research over recent decades has shown how the five patterns exemplified in (2)–(6) above can all ultimately be explained as arising out of an original transitive-unaccusative split along the lines of (1a-b), it is not at all obvious how the distribution of the Romanian auxiliaries fits in with this general development. The traditional answer to this question is to claim that the Romanian pattern arose as a result of contact with Slavonic

and, in particular, with Bulgarian. However, this view is highly implausible since Bulgarian, and Slavonic in general (with the notable exception of Macedonian), do not display any auxiliary alternation, but simply employ auxiliary BE in all contexts (D. Willis, p.c.); indeed, Bulgarian, along with many (eastern) Slavonic varieties, entirely lacks a verb HAVE. There is no simple way therefore to derive the observed binary pattern of auxiliary distribution found in Romanian from the single auxiliary system of Bulgarian (/Slavonic).

A more plausible answer to this question, we maintain, is to consider the Romanian pattern a development from the original transitive-unaccusative split of the type observed in (1a-b). Indeed, there is quite substantial evidence to support this idea. First, modern Romanian still retains a relic of auxiliary BE with a subset of unaccusatives when interpreted with a resultative value (Avram 1994:494, 506–508; Motapanyane 2000:16; Avram and Hill 2007:49–52; Nevaci and Todi 2009:142; Dragomirescu 2010:210; Pană Dindelegan 2013c:228)[4], as illustrated by the relative acceptability of HAVE (8a) and BE (8b) with punctual and resultative temporal adverbials in the following examples taken from Dragomirescu and Nicolae (2009).

(8)   a.   Ion **a**/ ***e** sosit ieri /   de   ieri
               John has is arrived yesterday   since   yesterday
               în oraş
               in city
               "John arrived yesterday/since yesterday in the city"
        b.   Ion **e**/***a** sosit   de   ieri   în oraş
               John is has arrived since   yesterday in city
               "John has been here since yesterday in the city"

Crucially, as Dragomirescu and Nicolae observe, the distribution of BE in such cases is not indiscriminate, but is limited to a subclass of unaccusatives, namely verbs of directed motion and change of location and verbs of (dis)appearance situated at the top of Sorace's (2000) Auxiliary Selection Hierarchy. Significantly, a similar, if not identical,

---

[4] Cf., for example, Nevaci and Todi (2009:142): "The type with the auxiliary *to be* in the present tense + participle active is frequent in the Southern idioms and shifts the perspective from the action proper towards the result of the action, which thus appears as present", and Dragomirescu (2010:12) who observes that "the appearance of *a fi* ["to be"] is employed with predicates which denote the final point or result of a change of state, whereas *a avea* ["to have"] is employed to mark the change of state."

phenomenon is reported by Manente (2008:42ff.) to have occurred in the recent history of Québécois French, where auxiliary HAVE has been extended to unaccusatives of change of location (cf. also Bentley and Eythórsson 2003). Although in such cases HAVE has now replaced original BE to mark punctual events (9a), auxiliary BE survives with these same verbs under the resultant state interpretation (9b).

(9)   a.   Jean **a**   arrivé / parti / entré / tombé à huit
                  Jean has arrived left   entered fallen at eight
                  heures /   en   deux   minutes
                  hours   in   two   minutes
                  "Jean arrived/left/came in/fell at eight/in two minutes"
         b.   Jean   **est**   arrivé / parti / entré / tombé
                  Jean   is   arrived left   entered fallen
                  "Jean is here/away/in(side)/on the floor"

The Québécois French facts thus replicate patterns found in Romanian, inasmuch as relics of auxiliary BE are restricted in both varieties to resultative readings of a similar subclass of unaccusatives (viz. verbs of directed motion), the only difference being that we have documented evidence of the original HAVE-BE transitive-unaccusative split, of which resultative BE is a residue, in the recent history of Québécois French, but not in Romanian.

Second, further proof that Romanian must have once displayed a traditional transitive-unaccusative auxiliary split along the lines of (1a-b) comes from the observation that in old Romanian participles of unaccusatives often show participle agreement with the subject (Uritescu 2007:555; Zamfir 2007:165–166, 209–210; Dragomirescu 2010:210; Pană Dindelegan 2013c:226), an unmistakable structural residue of one of the classic reflexes of BE selection with unaccusative participles (Loporcaro 1998; Ledgeway 2012:326–328, 347–349).

(10)   a.   Era   venit**e**
                  (they)be.IMPERF.3   come.F.PL
                  "They had come"
         b.   Au   fost   mur**i**ț**i**
                  they.have   been   died.M.PL
                  "They had died"

The third and final piece of evidence, which we shall consider in detail in §3.1 below, comes from the particular development of the largely

analytic tense, aspect and mood (TAM) system of Romanian. As we shall see, the structural consequences of this particular formal development of the Romanian TAM system have contrived to produce the observed finiteness split, which historically overlays and effaces an original underlying HAVE-BE transitive-unaccusative split.

Consideration of this latter development feeds directly into our second question regarding how the distribution of HAVE and BE in modern Romanian should be accounted for in synchronic structural terms. In essence, we shall argue that their complementary distribution should be considered the surface effect of the design of Romanian clause structure, including the lexicalization of TAM by way of independent functional heads whose presence or absence in the clause determines the differing spell-out positions of the perfective auxiliary. In particular, we shall see that HAVE (viz. *am, ai, a…*) and BE (viz. *fi*) spell out different functional positions within the clause, the former occupying a high position and the latter the lower base position of the auxiliary. At the same time, we can profitably use these same distributional facts to throw light on some unresolved controversial issues relating to the correct structural interpretation of Romanian subordination (cf. discussion in §5).

Our third and final question relates to what the distribution of the Romanian auxiliaries can tell us more generally about theories of (Romance) auxiliary selection. As we shall see, the Romanian facts provide direct overt evidence for Benveniste's (1960) seminal derivational analysis of the BE/HAVE alternation, according to which forms of copula/auxiliary HAVE are to be interpreted as nothing more than the superficial manifestation of the incorporation of a(n abstract) locative preposition into an underlying copula/auxiliary BE (cf. also Freeze 1992; Kayne 1993), as transparently evidenced in languages such as Breton where the morpholexical structure of HAVE overtly betrays such a derivation (Jouitteau and Rezac 2008). Indeed, we do not need to look far to find evidence for this type of alternation. Already Latin, for instance, displays an alteration between BE and HAVE in both possessive (11a) and resultative perfective constructions (11b; cf. Baldi and Nuti 2010:251–322).

(11)   a.   nulla   **tibi**   lingua**st**/
              none.NOM.F.SG   you.DAT tongue.NOM.F.SG=is
              si decem **habeas**   linguas
              if ten   you.have.SUBJ   tongues.ACC
              "have you got no tongue?/even if you had ten tongues"

b.	tanti	**sunt**	**mi**	**emptae**? /
	such.ABL	are	me.DAT	bought.F.PL

	eum	autem	**emptum**	**habebat**
	it.ACC	but	bought. M.SG	(he)had

	cum	socio	(Var. *Rust.* 2.2.5/Cic. *Tull.* 16)
	with	partner.ABL	

"have I bought them at such a price?/but he had had a partner in the purchase"

And even closer to home we can find BE/HAVE contrasts like those from Romanian and Italian in (12a-b):

(12)   a.   **Mi-e**   foame / sete / somn / frică / ruşine
             me.DAT=is   hunger thirst sleep fright shame
        b.   **Ho**   fame / sete / sonno / paura / vergogna
             (I)have hunger thirst sleep fright shame
             "I am hungry/thirsty/sleepy/frightened/ashamed"

Indeed, in recent years Benveniste's analysis has been taken up again with varying degrees of success under various generative reformulations, including, among others, Kayne (1993; 1999; 2000), Ledgeway (1998; 2000:ch. 6; 2003), and Roberts (2013). What all these accounts have in common is their shared assumption that BE together with a null locative preposition represent the underlying, and by implication default, auxiliary construction (13a), from which auxiliary HAVE is derived as the morpholexical spell-out of a process by which the locative preposition attracts BE, forcing the latter to incorporate into it (13b).

(13)   a. $[_{TP}$ P°   …**BE** $[_{v\text{-}VP}$PpleP]] $\Rightarrow$
        b. $[_{TP}$**HAVE** (= BE+   P°)   …~~BE~~ $[_{v\text{-}VP}$PpleP]]

This approach therefore predicts that auxiliary HAVE should be spelt out in a higher position than that of auxiliary BE in order for the incorporation process to obtain. However, such accounts are in large part based on circular, theory-internal reasons which are not readily supported by overt superficial evidence. For example, in person-driven auxiliary systems, Kayne (1993) stipulates that the abstract locative preposition does not incorporate into BE if participial Agr features are strong, as happens with 1st/2nd persons, but is forced to undergo incorporation into BE yielding HAVE when Agr features are said to be weak, as in the case of 3rd person subjects. Taking, for example, the representative Abruzzese